

In 1959, the Dalai Lama was forced to flee his homeland of Tibet and seek refuge in India. In over 40 years in exile, the Dalai Lama has remained a true leader with integrity, inspiring others with his actions and philosophies. He has promoted compassion, non-violence, and peace as a solution both to the current crisis in Tibet and to other conflicts around the world.

The Dalai Lama has promoted democratic self-government and self-determination for Tibetans in exile as a model for securing freedom for all of Tibet, and he demonstrated his commitment thereto by relinquishing his political positions and turning these authorities over to elected Tibetan representatives. He works now for a peaceful solution for the Tibetan crisis that promises a future of autonomy; however, he has not called for independence and separation from China.

The Dalai Lama was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1989 in recognition of his non-violent methods for resolving conflict and his continuous efforts to create a peaceful resolution in Tibet.

I am proud to say that Congress has consistently supported the people of Tibet, speaking out against the persecution of Tibetans, and opposing the destruction of over 6,000 monasteries. The torture and abuse of Tibetan monks and nuns is unacceptable, and we must do more to bring the world's attention to the impoverishment of Tibetans in their own land.

We must provide support for the refugees who have made the difficult decision to embark upon their journey to leave Tibet and seek refuge from persecution in foreign lands. As Ranking Member of the Immigration and Claims Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, I have compassion and empathy for their struggle for recognition of basic human rights as well as the adjustment it takes to resettle in a foreign land.

I am proud to join my colleagues today and advocate peaceful solutions to political problems. I believe we should encourage all parties to engage in positive dialogue to effectively reach a conclusion without violence. The Dalai Lama has been a role model and hero to his community, and his noble life should be an example to us all.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 359.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative

days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the motion to go to conference on H.R. 2555, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2555, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2555) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. SABO

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SABO moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 2555, be instructed to insist on inclusion of the highest possible level of funding for each homeland security, preparedness and disaster response program within Titles II, III and IV and on inclusion of House General Provision 521.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO).

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as we meet today on the eve of September 11, I am one Member who remains very concerned about America's safety and the safety of the flying public. We can and must do more. My motion is just one important step in the right direction.

This motion to instruct conferees is very straightforward. It is a motion to instruct the House conferees to insist on the highest possible level of funding for each homeland security, preparedness and disaster response program in the bill and to insist on the amendment adopted on the House floor by a vote of 278 to 146 to require the screening of cargo carried in the belly of passenger aircraft.

As the conference on the fiscal year 2004 homeland security appropriations bill begins, we now have an opportunity to provide additional homeland security resources and help close known security gaps. We should do so. We should correct one of the most glaring

gaps in our aviation security program, the fact that all passengers and their bags are screened for explosives and weapons, but cargo carried in the same place as passenger baggage is not screened at all. The Markey amendment adopted on the floor seeks to eliminate this air security gap. The House conferees should insist on it.

Some have argued that the screening of cargo carried on passenger aircraft is impossible to do immediately and would result in a \$3 billion loss to the airline industry. This is an argument of a pre-9/11 America. We now screen passengers and their baggage. We did not before. We now secure cockpits. We did not before. Where there is a will, there is a way. The Congress either does or does not have that will. I think that the American public would "will" us to have the cargo carried on the airplanes they fly in screened.

I must point out, however, that the Markey amendment addressed only one of the homeland security gaps that exist today. There are many others. The higher levels in some of the funding differences between the House and Senate bills would help address other homeland security and preparedness shortfalls. The first affects the preparedness of our first responders. The House bill provides \$3.5 billion for the Office for Domestic Preparedness, \$625 million more than the Senate. If we were to accept the Senate level, our States and localities would lose \$625 million in funding that helps to better equip and train our Nation's first responders.

Only a few months ago, the Council on Foreign Relations released a report entitled, "First Responders, Drastically Underfunded, Dangerously Unprepared." The report stated that billions of dollars are needed to properly equip first responders. I do not know if their estimate is right, but I do know that a great deal of additional funding is needed. Therefore, our conferees should insist on the highest funding level possible.

The second has to do with our ability to identify and respond to medical emergencies. The House bill provides \$50 million for the Metropolitan Medical Response System. The Senate bill provides no funding. Not to fund this system would widen the homeland security gap that we have been trying to close.

The third deals with the porousness of our northern border, which is well known. The Air and Marine Interdiction office has told us of instances of smugglers and others being caught coming across our northern border.

□ 1230

Yet today we have no permanent air surveillance of our northern border.

The Senate bill provides a total of \$71 million to permanently monitor air activity along our northern border. The House bill provides no funding for this. I think we all see the need to fund this homeland security improvement.

The Senate bill provides a total of \$459 million for procurement and installation of airport explosive detection systems. The House bill provides \$335 million. A number of our Nation's airports may not meet the December 31 deadline for electronic screening of all checked baggage due to the fact that TSA has been slow to fund needed modifications. We should provide all of the funding we can to allow TSA to act quickly.

The Senate bill provides \$74 more than the House for 570 new Border Patrol agents and additional inspectors. The House bill provides few staffing increases in this area. The PATRIOT Act called for tripling of the number of agents and inspectors on our northern border, and the Senate funding would result in us meeting that requirement for border agents.

Lastly, the Senate bill provides \$156 million more than the House bill for Disaster Relief. We have woefully underfunded the Disaster Relief program for this year and now it looks like FEMA only has enough funding to get them to the beginning of the fiscal year 2004.

FEMA has been distributing only the funding that States and localities can immediately spend, so the backlog is growing. This further strains our citizens and communities that are already in distress.

Because all of these important programs may help close some of today's homeland security gaps and better prepare our Nation, this motion to instruct directs the House conferees to agree to the highest funding levels possible for homeland security, preparedness, and disaster response programs and to insist on inclusion of the Markey amendment to screen air cargo on passenger aircraft.

In summary, let me say that we should be doing all we can to close known security gaps today, not tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this motion to instruct conferees.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN). Does the gentleman from Minnesota have additional speakers?

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, yes, I do. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking Democrat of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that we appoint conferees and begin the conference on this, the day before September 11, as the gentleman from Minnesota has indicated. It is not appropriate, however, that we will be considering a conference bill in which the budget allocation of the House and Senate equals only \$29.4 billion, a mere 2.3 percent above today's funding. That does not even equal inflation.

The House and the Senate bills are, in this case, a bit different. The House

bill provides more funding for first responders. The Senate bill provides more funding to secure our northern border, as the gentleman has indicated, for airport security and for Disaster Relief. All of that is needed, plus more.

The House bill also includes the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) to require that cargo carried on passenger aircraft is screened. This is the right thing to do. Today no cargo is screened. According to a TSA public statement there is a 35 to 65 percent likelihood that terrorists are planning to put a bomb in cargo on a passenger plane. But even if we were to do all of the things required and funded in the House and Senate bills, we will still leave many homeland security problems to deal with for another day.

Neither the House nor the Senate bill provides any funding to improve security at the perimeters or backsides of our airports. The ability to easily penetrate those backsides of our airports has been demonstrated on numerous occasions, most recently in New York, where fishermen lost due to a storm came ashore on the back side of JFK Airport and no one spotted them.

Neither the House nor the Senate bill provides sufficient funding to secure our ports by implementing the port security plans required under the Maritime Transportation Security Act in anything less than 20 years. Neither the House nor the Senate bill provides funding to fully implement the Markey amendment. Neither the House nor the Senate bill provides funding for Customs to substantially increase the checking of cargo entering through our ports for weapons of mass destruction.

The GAO has said that the current low inspection rate makes container shipments a prime target for terrorists. So I support the motion to instruct, because it is the only motion that we can offer under House rules which makes sense.

I do not support the majority party budget system that has gotten us to this ridiculous situation under which it is apparently fine to move quickly on an \$87 billion supplemental package for Iraq, but not fine to add a small percentage of this amount to better secure our homeland, our ports, our borders and our airports.

What kind of security do we have, when an individual could recently ship himself in a container from New York to another location in this country and not be detected, even though you had a human being inside the cargo box? I mean, how secure are we when that can happen? We have a long way to go before we meet the promises that so many of us made after 9/11.

The President told the country 2 days ago that 9/11 had taught him that we need to provide whatever is necessary for the security of the country. That being the case, I wish that he would accept some of the increases that we have asked for for more than a year-and-a-half on a bipartisan basis in

this House. I wish that we did not have a President who was vetoing more than \$1.5 billion of homeland security items that were passed in a bill that had 90 percent support of Republicans and Democrats alike in both the House and the other body. I wish we could get together on these items, which are clearly essential to the safety of our public and to the strength of this country at home.

I would urge Members to support the motion to recommit. It is the very least that we can do under these circumstances to secure the home front while we are obliterating the budget surplus by what we spend abroad to do the same thing.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from Wisconsin for their leadership on this issue.

The issue that I am going to address today is one that goes to the heart of how serious we are in this country about protecting innocent Americans from a successful al Qaeda attack. On the second anniversary of September 11, we know that al Qaeda still maintains that planes are at the very top of their list of potentially successful attacks upon the physical and psychological well-being of our Nation.

Twenty-two percent of all air cargo in the United States is actually placed on passenger planes; not on cargo planes, on passenger planes. For each of us, as we get on a plane they screen our shoes, they screen our computers, our cell phones, our carry-on bags. Our luggage, if it is checked, is screened before it is put into the belly of the plane. But the cargo which is placed on that very same plane is not screened.

Now, we saw yesterday what happens, when a young man, Charles McKinley, successfully shipped himself from New York to Dallas without being detected except at the point at which he emerged from his box on the doorstep of his parents.

This is a funny cartoon about a very deadly, serious subject. If you are wearing shoes and pants, you get searched at the airport. If you are wearing a dress and heels, you get searched at the airport. But if you are wearing a box, like Charles McKinley, neither you nor the box gets searched. That is a homeland security hole that will get filled by al Qaeda if we do not fill it ourselves.

What the Transportation Security Administration and the Bush administration likes to call a "known shipper" program, I call an "unknown cargo" program. The known shipper regulations are a bureaucratic paper exercise, not a serious security program. Charles McKinley's little escapade has exposed the known shipper program as a complete and total fraud. What Mr. McKinley has pointed out to our country is

that if an enemy wants to terrorize this country, they do not need to worry about hiding a box cutter; they just need to sit quietly inside a box.

The Transportation Security Agency has announced yesterday that it is going to develop an individual passenger profile of every airline passenger based on the risk that they pose to committing a future act of terrorism. So in addition to taking off our shoes, having someone rifle through our luggage, having to pass through metal detectors, we will also be given a color code. Well, if you are shipping cargo, your color code is always the same, green. Go, put it on the passenger plane. Al Qaeda is, in fact, targeting these planes as a subject for the further terrorization of our country.

Now, Pan Am Flight 103 was brought down in 1988 over Lockerbie, Scotland, by a bomb contained in unscreened baggage. Today the victims of Pan Am Flight 103 are still concerned about airline security, and have endorsed the Markey-Shays amendment to require screening or inspection of cargo loaded on to passenger planes. In addition, the Coalition of Airline Pilots of America, which pilots so many of these planes, has also endorsed the Markey-Shays amendment, the idea of screening all cargo placed on passenger planes.

It is crazy for people to be sitting on planes with their screened shoes looking out the window at a cargo truck now loading cargo on the very same plane that has not been screened. We could have al Qaeda in a box just being shipped on these planes. They do not need a boarding pass to get on above, they can put their bombs on without a boarding pass underneath on the very same passenger plane. You could ship a terrorist through this loophole.

So, while up above in the passenger cabin we now have screening for the passengers, we have air marshals, we have a double reinforced steel door to the pilot's cabin, we have armed pilots and passengers who will jump any al Qaeda from now on, meanwhile, down below, nothing which will stop them from putting this cargo on.

Support this motion to instruct. The White House, the Senate, the cargo and airline industry must listen to the American people.

□ 1245

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER), the ranking Democrat on the authorizing committee.

Mr. TURNER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this is the week that we remember that attack on America that occurred on September 11, 2001. It is a time of mourning, a time of remembrance. We all remember the horror of the Twin Towers, the Pentagon, the crash in the open field in Pennsylvania. We remember the determination on the faces of firefighters and the workers who entered the fiery inferno in a val-

iant attempt to save the lives of people they did not know. We remember the resolve and the commitment that resounded throughout this Congress and this Nation in the aftermath of that dreadful day.

Never again, we said, would we be caught unprepared. Never again would we send some of our bravest citizens, our police, our firefighters, our emergency workers into harm's way unable to communicate with one another. Never again would we allow large security gaps that could be exploited by those who seek to do us harm.

Mr. Speaker, in the aftermath of September 11, this Congress responded with unprecedented speed and unity. We authorized the President to use force against the al Qaeda network and their sponsors, the Taliban. We enacted legislation to overhaul airport security, fortify our borders, secure our seaports. We proposed formation of a new Department of Homeland Security. These actions were only the first steps in what we intended to be a sustained effort to secure America from the threat of terrorist attack.

But, Mr. Speaker, 2 years after the attacks, security gaps remain; and it is our solemn duty to do all we can to move faster, to take stronger measures to deliver security to the American people. Two years after September 11, we still lack a unified terrorist watch list to help us thwart the attacks before they occur. Two years after September 11, our forces on the border need reinforcement and the Coast Guard is stretched to its limits trying to carry out its mandate to secure our ports and coastlines. We must deploy stronger forces on our borders and protect our ports and coastline to close that security gap. Two years after September 11, the first responders, the valiant men and women who risk all to keep us safe, do not have the equipment and training that they need to meet the threats posed by chemical, biological, and radiological attacks. First responders do not have the equipment they need to communicate at a disaster site. Clearly, we must move faster; we must be stronger in our commitment to these frontline soldiers.

Therefore, I fully support the motion offered by the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Homeland Security of the Committee on Appropriations.

We have been told that we are safer today than we were before September 11 of 2001, but that is not the test that we must pass. The question before us is are we as safe as we must be to protect the American people. By this measure, we have much yet to do. The sums requested by this motion are essential to fulfilling our commitment to protecting the American people. This is the first responsibility of government, and nothing else matters if we fail.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR).

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

If there had been a simple regulation in place in December 1988, Pan Am 103 likely never would have happened, and that is passenger bag match, an issue that later, the Commission on Aviation Security and Terrorism appointed by President Bush on which I served and my good colleague at the time, John Paul Hammerschmidt from this body, recommended. But it was recommended earlier in hearings that I had chaired as Chair of the Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight that we have passenger bag match. Because when the aircraft arrived from Malta at Frankfurt, Germany, for the beginning of the Pan Am 103 trip and a bag was transferred from the Malta aircraft to the 727 of Pan Am to go on to London, the bag went on, but the passenger did not. If we had the rule in place that if the passenger is not on, the bag comes off, that bomb would never have been on board that plane.

Today, we have passenger bag match at American airports as a result of the Transportation Security Act that we passed in the aftermath of September 11. A much tougher bill, it did the things that our commission recommended in 1990.

So today, we have a situation where the TSA screeners at the Nation's airports know what is in the carryon, they know what is on your body, and if you have replacement parts, they know what is in your body; but they do not know what is in the box that goes in the cargo hold on that airplane, and they need to know that. Known shipper cargo match is a good idea, but screening that box as well is a better idea, and that is what we need to know.

In addition, I think unfortunately, while the committee and the chairman and the ranking member did all they could with the money available, the amounts provided in this bill for port security are grossly inadequate to meet the threat of international terrorism, which is moving to the new level of port security problems. The House-passed bill had \$150 million for port security grants, the Senate had \$100 million for port security grants. The Coast Guard has told our committee, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, that it will cost ports and port operators \$1.6 billion in the next 2 years to comply with the security standards this body already voted and put into law. In the last round of security grants, there was \$150 million available and \$1 billion worth of applications.

One does not have to think too far back to the USS *Cole* with a small boat loaded with explosives ramming into the side of a U.S. naval war ship, blowing it to pieces, to imagine the same scenario in an offshore oil port in the Gulf of Mexico or in one of our busy ports on the east coast, the west coast, the Gulf Coast ports, or on one of the Great Lakes.

Neither the House nor the Senate Homeland Security Appropriation Act

includes any funding for conducting foreign port security assessments for the Coast Guard. We learned a lesson in aviation that we have to have American security personnel overseas, foreign airports, looking into their security arrangements and making independent assessments, and coming back and reporting to the FAA, to the Department of Transportation, and to the Congress. And we have the authority to say, if you do not do the security right overseas, your airplanes do not land in this country. So we have a hammer on them, and we can make them comply.

But in maritime, as a result of failure to have the funding for foreign port security assessments, those great maritime nations of Malta, Cyprus, Liberia, Panama, great Third World flag, third flag nations, are going to be the places that are going to conduct the security assessments and self-certify and say, everything is okay. It is not okay until we say so, until our Coast Guard is there with security personnel looking those ports over and assuring that they have put in place the measures that we require; and we have to do a better job on this side as well. Those Third World countries do little to enforce safety and security. We have to do it here, and we should do it in this bill.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY).

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I must say that I think the chairman and the ranking member of this committee have done as best they can with what they have to do with. I also must note that 2 years later we are still struggling with getting the job done, and I think it is now time for us to press forward with all due haste to see that these homeland security issues are dealt with as quickly and as effectively as possible.

The House bill has \$650 million more for the Office of Domestic Preparedness. The conferees should give first responders this higher amount. The Senate bill has \$50 million for port security grants. That higher funding is critical. The President has asked for \$87 billion to make Iraq secure. Certainly, America deserves no less. We are spending about half as much, about half that much to try to make the American people secure.

The motion also instructs conferees to include a provision that requires all cargo on passenger planes to be screened. Obviously, this is something that needs to be done. But we do not want to be on this floor anytime in the future talking about what happened, what went wrong, what we should have done. Now is the time to deal with homeland security funded appropriately and get the job done for the American people that we know needs to be done and we know how to do it.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that I have the right to close, so I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us provides \$29.4 billion for the new Department of Homeland Security. That is an increase of over \$1 billion above the amounts proposed by the President, and it is \$535 million above the current year's spending.

This motion by the gentleman from Minnesota would result in more spending. We could spend all that we could beg, borrow, or steal in the name of homeland security, and it still would not be enough, according to some people. Throwing dollars at this problem of security will not necessarily add to our security. What we need is a sensible plan, spending sensible sums, for a comprehensive and complete system of protection of our people.

□ 1300

I think we have such a plan. And I am willing to accept the gentleman's motion and to do my best to meet its goals. But the motion gives me an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, on the eve of the day that changed America, 9-11, to reflect on that awful day, but also to reflect upon how far our Nation has come in protecting us from another such event.

The presumption in the motion is that we are not spending enough money to protect our Nation's homeland. I think the question is, is the glass half empty or is it half full? I think it is half full. We are not there yet, but we have come so far. We have come so far in these 2 years in protecting the country.

Since September 11 the Congress has provided almost \$76 billion for homeland security funding across the entire government. For the 22 agencies that now make up the new Department of Homeland Security, the Congress has provided almost \$44 billion through the current year, and then we add in the 2004 bill an additional \$29.4 billion, which brings the total to the Department for fiscal years 2002 through 2004 to \$73.3 billion. Protecting our borders is the first line of defense against terrorism. We include in the bill \$9 billion for border protection and related activities. That is an increase of \$400 million over fiscal 2003. Including \$2 billion for U.S. Coast Guard homeland security activities.

We make innovative technology and capital investments a priority, recognizing that our borders will only be secure when we use a combination of people and technology. But let us talk about the borders just a minute.

We have added inspectors, special agents, border patrol agents to these borders, we have added 5,400 new personnel at those borders. That increases the coverage in our ports by 25 percent. In addition to that, we have added 4,100 Coast Guard personnel to protect the ports, to protect the waterways, to increase the intensity and numbers of inspections at ports of entry into the

country; 4,100 new Coast Guard people on the job today that were not there before.

We will continue, and hear me now, we will continue to inspect 100 percent of all high-threat cargo and high-threat vessels coming into our waters. We cannot discuss in this open forum all that is being done in that respect. We would have to go into a classified briefing to do so, which we have done. I cannot talk about all of those things, but we are inspecting 100 percent of all high-threat cargo and high-threat vessels coming into our waters.

We have heard a lot about port security. In this bill we add \$100 million, another down payment to secure the critical port facilities. We add that to the \$388 million that is already appropriated for port security grants, a total funding level now of \$488 million. Radiation detectors, other technology, \$263 million for cargo screening and these technologies have been deployed at our busiest land and sea ports including Miami, Los Angeles, Newark. And we include in this bill another \$129 million for these technologies, which brings that total to \$392 million.

It has been said that we need to search these container pieces coming to us offshore before they get here. And that is precisely what the administration proposed and the Congress agreed to. We provide \$60 million for a thing called the Customs Container Security Initiative, fully funding that effort since it began. We include \$62 million in this bill bringing total funding for that project to \$122 million. And with that money, we are now in the process, either in the process or already searching these container pieces at 20 of the mega-ports around the world that ship us 80 percent of our container freight, searching those targets, that high-threat cargo before it ever reaches American ports so that we do not have to do it here.

We also place a very high priority on funding our State and local first responders. Homeland security, we have all said, is hometown security. And our hometowns are protected by our local firemen, local police, emergency personnel and the like. We have not shunned them and it is essential that they have the resources to address the needs of our hometowns. We will never forget the heroism on 9-11, of those wonderful first responders, so many of whom unfortunately gave their lives on 9-11. We include \$4.4 billion in this bill for those people, law enforcement, fire fighters, emergency personnel. And since September 11, the Congress has provided nearly \$21 billion for those State and local governments, for terrorism prevention and preparedness, most of which is going to our local first responders. Almost \$21 billion for your firemen, your first responders, your emergency technicians, your policemen, and more is on the way.

Science and technology efforts are critical to improving security, increasing the efficiency of what we do and increasing the costs. We include in this

bill \$900 million for science and technology, including \$60 million to design, develop and test anti-missile devices for commercial aircraft, \$60 million.

Then, of course, transportation security for those who fly. Since September 11, we have provided a total of \$10.3 billion for passenger safety through the Transportation Security Administration, including passenger, baggage, and cargo screening. An additional \$5.172 billion is included in the fiscal 2004 bill. And since September 11, we have included \$1.5 billion on explosive and trace detection systems, including the development, procurement, and installation. We include in this bill \$335 million more to buy more of these systems, as well as \$50 million for air cargo safety, and \$40 million for research on next generation technologies.

We come to this question that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) has brought to our attention, and that is the safety or security of cargo on passenger planes. I think we all agree with his goal. It is our goal. It has been the goal of this subcommittee since we came into being, it seems like a long time ago, but it was only back in March that the subcommittee came into being. And, frankly, I am very proud of what our subcommittee has done. We have begun a staff. We had to find a place to meet. We had to hold hearings in Department where many of the principals were not yet sworn into office or confirmed, get the budget together, hold hearings, and then finally mark up a bill. And I am very proud to say that we were the first of the 13 appropriations bills brought to the floor and passed through the body, and we are the first to go to conference with the Senate. That is quite a record.

I am proud of the members of the subcommittee on both sides of the aisle, and I am especially proud of the staff on both sides of the aisle who have done a remarkable job of pulling all of this together.

We included in this bill \$50 million for air cargo screening. The Senate bill has 60. I think we can go higher and give the TSA the resources it needs for the development of an air cargo screening program for domestic and foreign cargo carriers and to develop a risk-based screening system, to identify pieces of cargo that require closer scrutiny even while we work at post-haste speed to develop the machinery that does not now exist to absolutely search all pieces going on passenger or cargo planes. Funds are also provided to research and development, new technologies that would make this happen.

Mr. Speaker, I have no problem with the motion to instruct. It is the goals that we share. We share the same goals that the motion elicits. I think we have developed a good bill. I am very proud of the efforts of the Nation since 9-11 to come to grips with a new terror, a new threat to our security. The President has led the effort on both fronts, that is to take the battle to the

terrorists on their own turf rather than wait until they come for us here, but at the same time preparing the Nation itself to defend itself against a terrorist who might make it through.

Do we have more to do? Absolutely. We have scratched the surface. But we have made a lot of progress and we will continue to make that progress.

Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to close.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, we have one speaker for the balance of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN). The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I think the message here is simple: If Members think that our ports are safe enough, our borders are safe enough, our airlines are safe enough, then by all means, vote against this motion. But if you recognize that they are not, then you ought to vote for it.

But I would have one cautionary note. I would say to my friends on the majority side of the aisle, please do not vote for this motion if you then intend to scuttle the Markey amendment in conference. If that were to happen, it would be tantamount to deceiving the public and trying to have it both ways.

If you voted for this motion, stick to it in conference or else everything that we have tried to do today will be as phony as a \$3 bill.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this motion to instruct conferees on our Nation's first Homeland Security Appropriations bill. Everyone expected that the new Homeland Security Department would experience the standard growing pains associated with the establishment of any new government agency and that such pains would get worked out over time. However, the situation that prompted the creation of this agency is different, and homeland security does not have the luxury to "get it right" over time. We must start getting it right the first time with this first appropriations bill. Accordingly, we must supply the necessary federal resources today, not tomorrow, and not after another terrorist attack.

While Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member OBEY did the very best they could given their inadequate allocation, many important homeland security initiatives and programs remain underfunded. Understandably, we have focused our homeland security efforts on passenger aviation. But we must quickly provide similar focus to securing other likely targets including air cargo, seaports, electronic business systems, and other critical infrastructure. Strengthening and making less vulnerable our electronic business transactions would help protect both California's utility power grid and its economy, the fifth largest economy in the world. Providing perimeter security and thorough cargo screening will help ensure the safety of passengers and employees at Los Angeles International Airport, the nation's sec-

ond busiest airport. Screening cargo ships before they reach the mega seaport of Los Angeles-Long Beach will not only maintain the economic integrity of the nation's largest intermodal container port, but also protect the residents of the portside communities. Adequately funding these efforts would produce real and immediate benefits for my state and community.

We must also sufficiently fund all functions of homeland security including border and customs efforts, disaster relief, and first responders. However, prioritizing and funding these various security initiatives as we have done with aviation security can only be accomplished with the necessary resources. It is critical, therefore, that we make our position crystal clear and instruct House conferees to insist on the highest possible level of funding for each homeland security, preparedness, and disaster response program.

Mr. Speaker, if in these grave economic times, the administration believes we can afford to spend an additional \$87 billion for the military and reconstruction effort in Iraq in our campaign to prevent terrorism, then it is morally bound to support our efforts in Congress to provide the necessary resources for our own security in America.

I urge my colleagues to support the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2622, FAIR AND ACCURATE CREDIT TRANSACTIONS ACT OF 2003

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 360 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 360

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2622) to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act, to prevent identity theft, improve resolution of consumer disputes, improve the accuracy of consumer records, make improvements in the use of, and consumer access to, credit information, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of